





RECEIVED

COMMISSIONER

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 2001 APR 18 P 2: 55

DATE:

APRIL 18, 2001

DOCKET NOS:

T-03616A-98-0486

TO ALL PARTIES:

AZ CORP COMMISSION

DOCUMENT CONTROL Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

APR 1 8 2001

DOCKETED BY

Enclosed please find the recommendation of Administrative Law Judge Jane Rodda The recommendation has been filed in the form of an Order on:

NETWORK INTERNATIONAL, LC (CC&N/RESELLER)

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-110(B), you may file exceptions to the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge by filing an original and ten (10) copies of the exceptions with the Commission's Docket Control at the address listed below by 12:00 noon on or before:

APRIL 27, 2001

The enclosed is NOT an order of the Commission, but a recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge to the Commissioners. Consideration of this matter has tentatively been scheduled for the Commission's Working Session and Open Meeting to be held on:

MAY 1, 2001 AND MAY 2, 2001

For more information, you may contact Docket Control at (602)542-3477 or the Hearing Division at (602)542-4250.

BRIAN C'. McNEI

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

1 BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 2 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL CHAIRMAN 3 JIM IRVIN **COMMISSIONER** 4 MARC SPITZER COMMISSIONER 5 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF DOCKET NO. T-03616A-98-0486 6 NETWORK INTERNATIONAL, LC FOR A CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND 7 NECESSITY TO PROVIDE COMPETITIVE DECISION NO. RESOLD INTEREXCHANGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, EXCEPT ORDER LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICES 9 Open Meeting 10 May 1 and 2, 2001 Phoenix, Arizona 11 BY THE COMMISSION: 12 Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the 13 Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") finds, concludes, and orders that: 14 FINDINGS OF FACT 15 On August 27, 1998, Network International, LC dba NIL LLC ("Applicant" or "NIL") 1. 16 filed with Docket Control of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") an application 17 for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("Certificate") to provide competitive resold 18 interexchange telecommunications services, except local exchange services, within the State of 19 Arizona. 20 In Decision No. 58926 (December 22, 1994), the Commission found that resold 2. 21 telecommunications providers ("resellers") were public service corporations subject to the 22 jurisdiction of the Commission. 23 3. Applicant is an Arizona limited liability company, authorized to do business in 24 Arizona since 2000. 25 Applicant is a switchless reseller, which purchases telecommunications services from 4. 26 facilities-based carriers. 27

5.

28

On July 25, 2000, NIL filed an Affidavit of Publication indicating compliance with the

Commission's notice requirements.

- 6. On August 18, 2000, the Commission's Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") filed its Staff Report in this matter. In its Report, Staff stated that NIL has provided unaudited financial statements for the year ended December 31, 1999. These financial statements list assets of \$3.5 million, total equity of \$1.8 million, and net income of \$870,181. Based on the foregoing, Staff believes that Applicant lacks adequate financial resources to be allowed to charge customers any prepayments, advances, or deposits without either establishing an escrow account or posting a surety bond to cover such prepayments, advances, or deposits. However, the Applicant has indicated as part of its application that it does not charge its customers for any prepayments, advances or deposits. If at some future date, the Applicant wants to charge customers any prepayments, advances or deposits, it must file information with the Commission that demonstrates the Applicant's financial viability. Upon receipt of such filing, Staff will review the information and the Commission will make a determination concerning the Applicant's financial viability and whether customer prepayments, advances or deposits should be allowed. Additionally, Staff believes that if the Applicant experiences financial difficulty, there should be minimal impact to its customers. Customers are able to dial another reseller or facilities-based provider to switch to another company.
 - 7. Staff recommended approval of the application subject to the following conditions:
 - (a) The Applicant should be ordered to comply with all Commission rules, orders, and other requirements relevant to the provision of intrastate telecommunications service;
 - (b) The Applicant should be ordered to maintain its accounts and records as required by the Commission;
 - (c) The Applicant should be ordered to file with the Commission all financial and other reports that the Commission may require, and in a form and at such times as the Commission may designate;
 - (d) The Applicant should be ordered to maintain on file with the Commission all current tariffs and rates, and any service standards that the Commission may require;
 - (e) The Applicant should be ordered to comply with the Commission's rules and modify its tariffs to conform to these rules if it is determined that there is a conflict between the Applicant's tariffs and the Commission's rules;

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

- (f) The Applicant should be ordered to cooperate with Commission investigations of customers complaints;
- (g) The Applicant should be ordered to participate in and contribute to a universal service fund, as required by the Commission;
- (h) The Applicant should be ordered to notify the Commission immediately upon changes to the Applicant's address or telephone number;
- (i) The Applicant's intrastate toll service offerings should be classified as competitive pursuant to Commission rules;
- (j) The rates proposed by the Applicant in its most recently filed tariffs should be approved on an interim basis. The maximum rates for these services should be the maximum rates proposed by the Applicant in its proposed tariffs. The minimum rates for the Applicant's competitive services should be the Applicant's total service long run incremental costs of providing those services;
- (k) In the event that the Applicant states only one rate in its proposed tariff for a competitive service, the rate stated should be the effective (actual) price to be charged for the service as well as the service's maximum rate; and,
- (l) The Applicant should be ordered to file conforming tariffs within 30 days of an Order in this matter, and in accordance with the Decision.
- 8. In its comments concerning fair value rate base, filed on January 4. 2001, Staff further recommended approval of NIL's applications subject to the following conditions:
 - (a) That NIL should be required to file in this Docket, within 18 months of the date it first provides service following certification, sufficient information for Staff analysis and recommendation for a fair value finding, as well as for an analysis and recommendation for permanent tariff approval. This information must include, at a minimum, the following:
 - 1. A dollar amount representing the total revenue for the first twelve months of telecommunications service provided to Arizona customers by NIL following certification, adjusted to reflect the maximum rates that NIL has requested in its tariff. This adjusted total revenue figure could be calculated as the number of units sold for all services offered times the maximum charge per unit.
 - 2. The total actual operating expenses for the first twelve months of telecommunications service provided to Arizona customers by NIL following certification.
 - 3. The value of all assets, listed by major category, used for the first twelve months of telecommunications services provided to Arizona customers by

NIL following certification. Assets are not limited to plant and equipment. Items such as office equipment and office supplies should be included in this list.

- (b) NIL's failure to meet the condition to timely file sufficient information for a fair value finding and analysis and recommendation of permanent tariffs shall result in the expiration of the Certificate of Convenience and Necessity and of the tariffs.
- 9. The Staff Report stated that Applicant has no market power and the reasonableness of its rates would be evaluated in a market with numerous competitors.
- 10. On August 29, 2000, the Arizona Court of Appeals, Division One ("Court") issued its Opinion in Cause No. 1 CA-CV 98-0672 ("Opinion"). The Court determined that Article XV, Section 14 of the Arizona Constitution requires the Commission to "determine fair value rate base for all public service corporations in Arizona prior to setting their rates and charges."
- 11. On October 26, 2000, the Commission filed a Petition for Review to the Arizona Supreme Court.
 - 12. On February 13, 2001, the Commission's Petition was granted.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. Applicant is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. §§ 40-281 and 40-282.
- 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Applicant and the subject matter of the application.
 - 3. Notice of the application was given in accordance with the law.
- 4. Applicant's provision of resold interexchange telecommunications services is in the public interest.
- 5. Applicant is a fit and proper entity to receive a Certificate for providing competitive interexchange telecommunications services as a reseller in Arizona.
- 6. Staff's recommendations in Findings of Fact Nos. 6, 7, and 8 are reasonable and should be adopted.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the application of Network International, LC dba NIL LLC for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for authority to provide competitive resold interexchange telecommunications services, except local exchange services, shall be and the same is hereby granted, except that Network International, LC dba NIL LLC shall not be authorized to charge customers any prepayments, advances, or deposits. In the future, if Network International, LC dba NIL LLC desires to initiate such charges, it must file information with the Commission that demonstrates the Applicant's financial viability. Staff shall review the information provided and file its recommendation concerning financial viability and/or the necessity of obtaining a performance bond within thirty (30) days of receipt of the financial information, for Commission approval.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Network International, LC dba NIL LLC shall comply with the Staff recommendations set forth in Findings of Fact Nos. 6, 7, and 8.

DECISION NO.

1	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that within 30 days of the effective date of this Decision,		
2	Network International, LC dba NIL LLC shall notify the Compliance Section of the Arizona		
3	Corporation Commission of the date that it will begin or has begun providing service to Arizona		
4	customers.		
5	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.		
6	BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.		
7			
8			
9	CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER		
10			
11	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive		
12	Secretary of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the		
13	Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix, this day of, 2001.		
14			
15	BRIAN C. McNEIL EXECUTIVE SECRETARY		
16	EAECUTIVE SECRETART		
17	DISSENT		
18	JR:mlj		
19			
20.			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1		
2	SERVICE LIST FOR:	NETWORK INTERNATIONAL, LC DBA NIL LLC
3	DOCKET NO.:	T-03616A-98-0486
5	Mark Sandler, President Network International, LC 1300 Piccard Drive, Suite 202 Rockville, Maryland 20850-4303	
6 7 8	Harisha Bastiampillai The Helein Law Group, PC 8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 700 McLean, Virginia 22102	
9	Christopher Kempley, Chief Counse	1
10	Legal Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COM!	MISSION
11	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007	
12	Deborah Scott, Director	
13 14	Utilities Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMI 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007	MISSION
15	Thoums, Theome of the	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		